



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,234	05/31/2001	Dean Tan	50277-1512	2418
42425 7590 12/18/2007 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083			EXAMINER WOOD, WILLIAM H	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/872,234

Applicant(s)

TAN ET AL.

Examiner

William H. Wood

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-43 and 45-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-43 and 45-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/3/07; 10/3/07; 10/17/07.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

WILLIAM WOOD
PRIMER

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21, 23-43 and 45-50 are pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03 October 2007 (copy of possible 17 September 2003 IDS), 03 October 2007 (copy of possible 04 June 2004 IDS) and 17 October 2007 (from previous IDS's, including corrected document submissions) are considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 and 23-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aronberg** et al. (USPN 5,933,647) in view of **Bigus** et al. (USPN 6,718,358).

Claim 1

Aronberg disclosed a method for installing and configuring an application on a device on a network, the method comprising the steps of:

sending, from the device to a server on a network, a request that (a) requests a application from the server (*column 4, lines 54-58*),

downloading, from the server, a customized value for a configuration parameter wherein the customized value was determined by the server (*column 2, lines 54-61, server provided/distributed customized configuration, thus parameter; column 2, lines 1-12; column 4, lines 48-49, 62-64, user is at the server; column 5, lines 44-48; column 9, lines 28-32; figure 4, variables to set; figure 7, variables set, files per directory*);

downloading the application to the device (*column 2, lines 59-61*);

installing the application on the device (*figures 4 and 7; column 9, lines 28-32*)

Aronberg did not explicitly state a database application, sending from the device resource information available on the device, downloading a configuration parameter to allocate resources on the device, or configuring the database application to include the configuration parameter. **Bigus** demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to install database applications (*column 1, lines 14-27 and lines 62-64*), to gather resource information from target devices (*column 1, lines 38-41; and column 4, lines 1-5; column 6, lines 9-16; figure 1, elements 130, 140, 150*), and to download and configure based upon configuration parameter (*column 1, lines 37-39*,

“adjusting existing resource allocations”; column 1, lines 50-52; column 4, line 13, 17-20; column 6, lines 9-16; figure 1, element 160). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the agent installation system of **Aronberg** with (via the agent requests and actions of **Aronberg**) database installation and parameter tuning, including requesting the software and describing the target environment, and from a server or source receiving the database and tuning or configuration information as found in **Bigus**’ teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to 1) provide databases along with any other software to a system as needed and 2) provide the most efficient functioning of any installed software (column 1, lines 38-41).

Claim 2

Aronberg did not explicitly state the method of Claim 1 further comprising the step of monitoring logs of actual use of the device resources. **Bigus** demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to tune databases via acquired metrics (column 1, lines 38-64; column 2, lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the installation system of **Aronberg** with software tuning as found in **Bigus**’ teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to improve performance of distributed/network systems (**Bigus**: column 1, lines 19-27 and lines 38-49).

Claim 3

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 2, further comprising, after the database application has been installed, tuning the value of the configuration parameter based on logs of actual use of the device resources (*see above claim 3*).

Claim 4

Aronberg and **Bigus** did not explicitly state the method of claim 1, wherein:

- ♦ the method further comprises, after requesting the database application from the server, receiving at the device a network address of a source for the database application; and
- ♦ the step of downloading the database application comprises downloading the database application to the device from the source.

Applicant Admitted Prior Art (MPEP 2144.03, C.) is taken that it was known at the time of invention to make use of distributed servers and downloading redirection. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the installation system of **Aronberg** and **Bigus** with receiving an alternate server to download from. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make use of standard network environments in order to increase usefulness and applicability of the installation system (for example: download

straight from the vendor, which is most likely to be most accurate and up-to-date).

Claim 5

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 4 wherein the source is a second server that is distinct from the server from which the database application is requested (*see above claim 4, for example downloading from vender*).

Claim 6

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the device is a database appliance having database software and non-database software tailored to the needs of the database software (**Bigus**: *disclosed database software as shown above; Aronberg*: *showed at least the agent software responsive to the database for installation; and Bigus*: *at least the tuning software responsive to the database software*).

Claim 7

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein:

- ♦ the server is a community server used to install the database application on a plurality of devices (**Aronberg**: *figure 1*); and

- ♦ the community server sends to each device of said plurality of devices initial customized values for the configuration parameter based on the resources on said each device (**Aronberg**: figure 1; column 4, lines 54-56).

Claim 8

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 4, wherein the source is a community server used to install the database application on a plurality of devices and the network is the Internet (**Aronberg**: figure 1; and above claim 4 vender example; and **Bigus**: column 2, line 45).

Claim 9

Aronberg and **Bigus** did not explicitly state the method of claim 1, wherein the server is a platform at an Internet database service provider (**Bigus**: column 2, line 45).

Claim 10

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 4, wherein the source is a platform at an Internet database service provider (see above claim 4, vender example).

Claim 11

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the data indicating device resources includes data indicating at least one of a consumable resource and an application already installed (**Aronberg**: column 5, lines 44-48; column 9, lines 28-32).

Claim 12

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 11, wherein the data indicating the consumable resource includes data indicating at least one of storage space, number of licensed users, maximum processor usage rate, and maximum transaction rate (**Aronberg**: column 5, lines 44-48; column 9, lines 28-32).

Claim 13

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein:

- ♦ the device is a database appliance having database software and non-database software tailored to the needs of the database software (**Bigus**: disclosed database software as shown above; **Aronberg**: showed at least the agent software responsive to the database for installation; and **Bigus**: at least the tuning software responsive to the database software); and

- ♦ the data indicating device resources includes a type of the database appliance (**Aronberg**: column 5, lines 44-48; **Bigus**: column 1, lines 62-64).

Claim 14

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the configuration parameter is at least one of a size for a shared global area of memory for the application, a size for a private cache memory, a size for a tablespace, and a size of a data block (**Aronberg**: column 5, lines 44-48; column 9, lines 28-32).

Claim 15

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 3, wherein the logs of actual use include data indicating at least one of number of disk reads, number of disk writes (**Aronberg**: column 2, lines 1-8).

Claim 16

Aronberg and **Bigus** did not explicitly state the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- ♦ sending to the server a request for selectable database applications,
and

- ♦ receiving from the server data indicating a set of one or more selectable database applications.

Applicant Admitted Prior Art (MPEP 2144.03, C.) is taken that it was known at the time of invention to select via a user an application for installation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the installation system of **Aronberg** and **Bigus** with user selecting software to install. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to a user further control over their system in order to make adjustments specific to their individual needs.

Claim 17

Aronberg and **Bigus** did not explicitly state the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- ♦ sending to a user data indicating a set of one or more selectable database applications; and
- ♦ receiving input from the user indicating the database application selected.

Applicant Admitted Prior Art (MPEP 2144.03, C.) is taken that it was known at the time of invention to select via a user an application for installation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the installation system of **Aronberg** and **Bigus** with

user selecting software to install. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to a user further control over their system in order to make adjustments specific to their individual needs.

Claim 18

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 17, wherein:

- ♦ the network is the Internet (**Bigus**: column 2, line 45); and
- ♦ the data indicating a set of one or more selectable database applications are sent from an internet database service provider system which manages the device (**Aronberg**: figure 1).

Claim 19

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the database application is configured to interact with a database server device distinct from the device (**Bigus**: column 1, lines 62-64 and column 2, line 45).

Claim 20

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method of claim 19, wherein the device and the database server device are managed by an internet database service provider system (**Bigus**: column 2, line 45).

Claim 21

The limitations of method claim 21 are substantially similar to the limitations of method claim 1 and as such are rejected in the same manner.

Claims 23-43

The limitations of computer-readable medium claims 23-43 are substantially similar to the limitations of method claims 1-21 and as such are rejected in the same manner.

Claims 47 and 48

Aronberg and **Bigus** disclosed the method or machine-readable medium, wherein the application is a database application (*see claim 1*).

4. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aronberg** et al. (USPN 5,933,647) in view of **Owens** et al. (USPN 5,555,416).

Claim 45

Aronberg disclosed a machine-implemented method, comprising the steps of: receiving, at an appliance, a document that includes elements that specify (a) steps for installing an application on the appliance (*column 2, lines 52-54*;

column 5, lines 30-35), and (b) customized parameter values to use when installing the application on the [appliance] (column 2, lines 52-54); and install the application on the [appliance] using the customized parameter values (column 3, lines 1-13; column 4, lines 35-38; installation commands).

Aronberg did not explicitly state after receiving the document, translating textual elements to commands. **Owens** demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to provide textual elements in installation documents (figures 8-11; column 2, lines 25-34) and to translate them after receiving (scripts are translated as executed). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the installation system of **Aronberg** with scripts, including textual elements, as found in **Owens'** teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a mechanism for system of flexible administrator control (**Aronberg**: column 4, lines 66-67; **Owens**: column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 1), preferably easily and efficiently developed such as an already existing system (scripts) disclosed by **Owens**.

Claim 46

The limitations of claim 46 are substantially the same as for claim 45 and as such are rejected in the same manner.

5. Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aronberg** et al. (USPN 5,933,647) in view of **Owens** et al. (USPN 5,555,416) in further view of **Bigus** et al. (USPN 6,718,358).

Claims 49-50

The limitations of claims 49-50 correspond to the limitations of claims 1 and 45-46 and as such are rejected in a corresponding manner.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 23-43; 45-46 and 49-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, it is noted that in **Aronberg** a server provides a customized configuration and thus parameters (*column 2, lines 54-61, server provided/distributed customized configuration, thus parameter; column 2, lines 1-12; column 5, lines 44-48; column 9, lines 28-32; figure 4, variables to set; figure 7, variables set, files per directory*). It is further noted that the user/administrator is working at the server level and thus the server provides the determination of configuration/customized parameters (*column 4, lines 48-49, 62-64, user is at the server*). Further it is noted that in **Bigus**, a model is built from information retrieved from a controllable target (figure 1, and above rejections). Then the model helps tune or configure the target (figure 1, and above rejections). Clearly resource allocation occurs (column 1, lines 37-39,

“adjusting existing resource allocations” to improve service levels; and above rejections). **Bigus**’ “configuration metric” is an information gathered, not a parameter configured (consistent with Applicant’s claim language). Careful analysis of Applicant’s claim language reveals information going up to the server and information coming down from the server, but not that it is the same variable or parameter.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)-272-3756. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.



**WILLIAM WOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

William H. Wood
Patent Examiner
AU 2193
December 16, 2007